

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN JOSE DIVISION

11 ZURICH AMERICAN INSURANCE) Case No.:12-CV-03777-LHK
12 COMPANY,)
13 Intervenor,) ORDER RE: COMPLAINT IN
14 v.) INTERVENTION
15 HUNTER ENGINEERING COMPANY, and)
16 DOES 1 through 40,)
17 Defendant.)
18 TYRONE CAMPBELL and KIM CAMPBELL,)
19 Plaintiffs,)
20 v.)
21 HUNTER ENGINEERNIG COMPANY, and)
22 DOES 1 through 40,)
Defendants.)

23
24 On June 12, 2012, Plaintiffs Tyrone Campbell and Kim Campbell filed a Complaint in the
25 Superior Court of California, County of Santa Clara against Defendants Hunter Engineering
26 Company and Does 1 through 40, seeking damages for personal injuries involving an alleged
27 incident on July 18, 2011, 112-CV-226352. *See* ECF No. 1, Notice of Removal from Superior
28 Court, County of Santa Clara (“Notice of Removal”), Ex. A. Specifically, Plaintiffs allege that
Plaintiff Tyrone Campbell was injured by a swing-air jack manufactured by Defendant Hunter
Engineering. *Id.* On July 18, 2012, Defendant Hunter Engineering Company filed a Notice of
Case No.: 12-CV-03777-LHK
ORDER RE: COMPLAINT IN INTERVENTION

1 Removal of Action under 28 U.S.C. § 1441(b), initiating the instant action. *See* Notice of
2 Removal.
3

4 On March 21, 2013, Proposed Intervenor Zurich American Insurance Company (“Zurich
5 American”) filed a “Complaint in Intervention FRCP Rule 25,” in the instant action. ECF No. 26.
6 The Complaint alleges that Zurich American provided workers’ compensation coverage for
7 Plaintiff Tyrone Campbell at the time of the incident, and that it has had to expend substantial sums
8 for disability indemnity and medical benefits paid to Plaintiff, and will be required to expend
9 further sums in the future for workers’ compensation disability indemnity, medical expenses, and
10 other benefits under the workers’ compensation laws of the State of California. *Id.* ¶¶ 5, 17.
11 Zurich American alleges that it is “entitled to intervene in this action, pursuant to the provisions of
12 [t]he Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Rule 24(a)(2) and Rule 24(b)(1)(B).” *Id.* ¶ 18.
13

14 In the same document, Zurich American included a “[Proposed] Order Granting Leave to
15 File Complaint in Intervention FRCP Rule 24.” *Id.* p. 7. The proposed order states, “Upon reading
16 and considering the foregoing Application for Order Granting Leave to Intervene and the
17 (Proposed) Complaint in Intevention attached thereto, for good cause appearing: IT IS HEREBY
18 ORDERED that ENDURANCE REINSURANCE COPRORATION¹ is granted leave to intervene
19 on this action, and to file aforesaid Complaint in Intervention.” *Id.* However, Zurich has not filed
20 an “Application for Order Granting Leave to Intervene,” nor has it filed any other motion to
21 intervene to comply with Rule 24’s procedural requirements. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 24(c) (“Notice
22 and Pleading Required. A motion to intervene must be served on the parties as provided in Rule 5.
23 The motion must state the grounds for intervention and be accompanied by a pleading that sets out
24 the claim or defense for which intervention is sought.”).
25

26 If Zurich American seeks to intervene in the instant action, it shall file an appropriate
27 motion after obtaining an available hearing date pursuant to the San Jose Judges’ Standing Order.
28 Prior to filing such a motion, Zurich American must meet and confer with the parties to seek a
stipulation to Zurich’s intervention.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

¹ The relationship of Endurance Reinsurance Company to the instant action, if any, is not clear.
Case No.: 12-CV-03777-LHK
ORDER RE: COMPLAINT IN INTERVENTION

United States District Court
For the Northern District of California

1
2 Dated: June 7, 2013
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Lucy H. Koh
LUCY H. KOH
United States District Judge